



Workplace Well-Being and Work Engagement among Employees in the Department of Public Works and Highways first and third District Engineering offices

Joel B. Yosores, MBA; Leo C. Naparota, PhD; Edgard S. Cabalida, EdD

Received: 26 Dec 2022; Received in revised form: 26 Jan 2023; Accepted: 01 Feb 2023; Available online: 08 Feb 2023

©2023 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract— This study aimed to assess the workplace well-being and how it affects the work engagement of employees in the Department of Public Works and Highways first and third engineering district offices during the calendar year 2022. The respondents were ninety-four (94) employees of the Department of Public Works and Highways first and third district engineering offices. The study used descriptive-correlational research design utilizing the quantitative approach with the aid of questionnaire checklist in gathering data employing frequency counting and percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskal-Wallis test and Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient. The study revealed that DPWH was manned by majority of the females, employees' belonged to the adult age 31-51, the majority of employees' length of service was six years and above, educational attainment was dominated by college level, and likewise there were also non-regular employees working in the DPWH. The study found out that the respondents' perceived level of workplace well-being is high. In addition, the study also found out that the respondents' perceived level of work engagement is highly engaged. However, the perceived level of the respondents in terms of intrusion of work into their private life is moderate. The study found out that the workplace well-being and work engagement of the employees did not differ significantly when measured by sex, age, length of service, educational attainment and type of employment. The study found out also that the workplace well-being and work engagement of the employees were not affected when measured by demographic profile. Furthermore, the study found out that employees' workplace well-being was positively related with, and strongly connected to, their work engagement. This indicates that workplace well-being was significantly related to employees' work engagement in the Department of Public Works and Highways. Hence, management strategy, organizational culture, working environment and policy of the Department of Public Works and Highways would be enhanced to boost the level of workplace well-being and employees' work engagement.

Keywords— Workplace Well-being, Work Engagement, Philippines

I. INTRODUCTION

The harsh working conditions and substantial risks make the construction sector as one of the most hazardous jobs in the world. For instance, the European construction industry recorded 782 fatal accidents in 2014, including persons falling, objects breaking or collapsing, and losing control of tools, equipment, and machines. The industry requires human labor and automation, and machines are not used, which makes the work physically challenging.

Workplace well-being is widely acknowledged as a vital component of successful organizations, contributing to desirable outcomes such as job retention and employee engagement. On the other hand, poor health contributes negatively to the economic and social well-being of construction workers in the workplace (Lingard & Turner, 2018). Furthermore, workers experiencing a hostile and poor working environment triggers downward spirals toward well-being (Shuck & Reio, 2014). Employees'

experiencing job tension, depression, burnout, and alienation from work impaired well-being (Sonnenstag, 2015). Moreover, disengaged employees result to lower productivity and high cost (Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, & Encarnacion, 2020).

This study on workplace well-being and work engagement is significant for it would help assess the present situation of the employees of construction companies. Job satisfaction, organizational respect, employer care, no intrusion of work into personal life, autonomy need, and relatedness need are important in improving the workplace well-being of employees (Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, & Encarnacion, 2020). Work engagement is considered to have great significance for both employees and employers. Consequently, work engagement is important for the organization's success (Lovina, Genuba, & Naparota, 2020). This study is important to the management for policy decision-making in terms of looking into important factors to be considered in motivating employees to engage in their work (Abun, Magallanez, Foronda, & Agoot, 2019).

Workplace well-being and work engagement correlated to so many studies with different factors. Thus, it reveals a significant correlation between workplace well-being and work engagement of employees. In other words, workplace well-being correlates significantly to work engagement (Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, & Encarnacion, 2020). Schuck and Reio (2014) indicated that workplace wellbeing affects work engagement. Therefore, employees' work engagement can be detrimental to the organization performance. Aiello, Tesi, & Gianetti (2018) also contend that there is a correlation between workplace wellbeing and work engagement. Workplace well-being influences work engagement (Rani, Radzi, Almutairi, & Rahman, 2022).

The construction company depends on individuals to produce outputs; thus, workers on construction sites must be protected. However, despite the positive contribution of the construction industry to economic development worldwide, the working conditions in the construction industry often present significant health, safety, and workplace well-being challenge for workers. On the other hand, studies differ in scope and delimitation because many focus on educational institutions' employees and private construction companies. In contrast, the present study will focus on the Department of Public Works and Highways government employees, particularly in Piñan District Engineering Offices and Dipolog City, Zamboanga del Norte.

Theoretical Framework

For this study, several theories were examined, such as the Self-Determination Theory and Work

Engagement Theory of Kahn. They considered the most relevant to lay a solid foundation to support this study.

This study is anchored on Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by Deci, and Ryan (2000) have presented several validated variables that contribute to the workplace well-being of employees, such as autonomy (deCharms, 1968), relatedness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), and competence (Harter, 1978). These are three basic psychological needs, and these needs are innate. They are called intrinsic motivational needs, and they are important in improving the workplace well-being of employees. Deci and Ryan (2000) argued that the workplace environment must support the growth of these needs to create a healthy workplace environment and the well-being of employees. The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by Ryan and Deci (2000), which contributes to workplace well-being, job satisfaction, organizational respect for employees, employer care, intrusion of work into private life, autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by Deci and Ryan (2000) which contributes to workplace well-being such as job satisfaction, organizational respect for employees, employer care, intrusion of work into private life, autonomy, competence, and relatedness.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to assess the workplace well-being and how it affects the work engagement of employees in the Department of Public Works and Highways first and third engineering district offices during the calendar 1 year 2022.

Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the Profile of the respondents in terms of:
 1. Sex;
 2. Age;
 3. Length of service;
 3. Educational attainment; and
 4. Employment status?
2. What is the perceived level of workplace well-being of employees in terms of:
 - 2.1 Work satisfaction;
 - 2.2 Organizational respect;
 - 2.3 Employer care;
 - 2.4 The intrusion of work into private life;
 - 2.5. Autonomy needs;
 - 2.6 Relatedness Needs; and
 - 2.7 Competence need?

3. What is the perceived level of work engagement of employees in terms of:

- 2.1 cognitive;
- 2.2 emotional;
- 2.3 physical?

4. Is there a significant difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being of the respondents when analyzed according to profile?

5. Is there a significant difference in the perceived level of work engagement of the respondents when analyzed according to profile?

6. Is there a relationship between workplace well-being and work engagement?

II. LITERATURE

Workplace Well-being

Workplace Well-being encompasses physical and mental health, leading to more comprehensive approaches to illness prevention and health promotion. Lower happiness levels have been linked to an increased risk of disease, illness, and injury, impaired immune function, delayed recovery, and shorter lifespans (Rani, Radzi, Alias, Almutairi, & Rahman, 2022). Poor health contributes to a stressful work environment, and excessive stress causes psychological, physiological, and sociological strains that cause poor performance in the workplace (George & Emuze, 2020). On the other hand, workplace well-being plays a vital role in the sustainability of organizations and individuals. For example, organizations that have implemented health programs at work reported positive business results such as increased employee retention, productivity, and psychological well-being, among various other benefits (Aryanti, Sari, & Widiana, 2020). Moreover, Workplace well-being has contributed to the emergence of a person's positive attitude, namely the attachment of workers (Kurniadewi, 2016.).

Work Satisfaction

The traditional notion of job satisfaction will be compared with the more recently studied form of well-being labeled as job engagement. For well-being in the form of job satisfaction, low satisfaction was associated with lower levels of well-being, particularly in terms of absolute, bidirectional incongruence. However, associations with low satisfaction were consistently in the opposite direction for well-being in terms of job engagement. Moreover, low satisfaction between actual and wanted levels was accompanied by more rather than less engagement, especially in terms of algebraic effects (Warr & Inceoglu, 2012).

Organizational respect

Respect can increase employee motivation to work for the firm. As a result, it should become an organizational culture consistently implemented by management toward their employees and employees toward management. Respect is seen as a fundamental human right in philosophy and ethics (Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, & Encarnacion, 2020). Potter (2014), a hierarchy will most likely be the dominating management approach without respect for collaboration. Inclusive and collaborative leadership implies respect for the leadership or management toward general or individual employees in the organization. Such inclusion makes the employees feel valued by the organization (Rogers & Ashforth, 2014). Moreover, the management or leadership has a deep regard for an individual employee. The employees feel worthy of themselves because of the qualities and capabilities they bring to the organization (Heatfield, 2019).

Employer Care

Wekelo (2018), Managing Director of HR and Operations at Actualize Consulting Firm, expressing empathy for employees should be one of management's responsibilities. He believes that building an assertive environment can become the organization's strength. In addition, a positive feeling of flourishing; usually, such positive well-being would lead to effective functioning (Huppert & So, 2013). Wekelo (2018) further argues that when an employer treats their employees as human beings with feelings and dignity, not just workers, it makes a significant difference in the workplace. Based on her surveys, she argued that most employees wanted their managers to show empathy to their employees. Within the empathetic environment, management sees employees as partners in carrying out the vision and mission of the organization. Thus, in the first place, the administration should show the employees the organization's direction (Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, & Encarnacion, 2020).

The Intrusion of Work into Private Life

It is a fact that nowadays, the office job has no boundaries. The work is frequently extended to the employee's home. It's intended to be family time, but it's actually used for official business. Such a situation may arise, among other reasons, because employees are obliged to complete specific work within a specified period, but the employees are unable to complete the task within the imposed limit within the workplace (Shorr, 2017). In addition, Dresdale (2016) stated that work extends into employees' private zones and consumes their personal lives. Such behavior might have a negative impact on an employee's self-esteem and well-being. The line

between business and personal life appears to have blurred, with no boundaries and no gaps.

Autonomy Need

Autonomy is the situation in which the employees are given the freedom

and can set their schedules and allow them to decide on their work. It is considered an essential psychological need to be developed because the employees may experience volition and self-direction when they are given the freedom to control their work (Legault, 2016). Abun (2019), every human has three fundamental psychological needs: autonomy, relatedness, and competence. Deci and Ryan (2000) discovered that meeting these three requirements is crucial or necessary for optimal human functioning and well-being. When the three demands are not met, an individual becomes demotivated, and their growth is hampered, leading to frustration (Vansteenkiste & Ryan, 2013). As a result, the objective of management is to ensure that these innate demands are met or developed.

Competency Need

Competence is one of the innate psychological needs of a human being. It is inherent because the human being is born with it, and therefore a proper environment is needed for such need to grow (Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, & Encarnacion, 2020). Further stated that competence allows individuals to explore the environment and engage in challenging tasks to test their abilities and skills. Furthermore, satisfying such needs enables the individual to adapt to complex and changing environments, whereas competence frustration is likely to result in helplessness and a lack of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Moreover, Legault (2017) stated that the desire to satisfy the need for competence motivates people to persist and maintain efforts and self-determination to continue to improve one's skills and abilities. Satisfying competence need is essential for psychological growth and well-being.

Relatedness Need

Relatedness is a social need in which a human being needs to be involved with family, friends, co-workers, and employers. Relatedness need is one of a human's innate basic psychological needs. Person has such needs by nature, and they cannot live without them. Therefore, such a need must be nurtured or developed for a human being to reach its optimal function (Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, & Agoot, 2019). Fulfilling the three basic psychological needs, such as existence, relatedness, and growth, contributes to employees' well-being. Similarly, point out that daily well-being is the product of the fulfillment of autonomy and satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs that

contribute to employees' well-being (Chang, Huang, & Lin, 2015)

Work Engagement

The concept of work engagement looks like money is not mentioned as part

of the whole process of work engagement. It was argued that, in the beginning, one might decide to join a particular company because of the salary, the company's brand name, and other benefits. Still, it is not necessarily translating into work engagement as understood by different experts mentioned above. Still, work engagement happens when the employee finds meaning, autonomy, impact, and connection or MAGIC in what the employees do (Abun, Magallanez, Foronda, & Agoot, 2019). Many workers are reluctant to head to work, lacking energy and passion for their job. This is the challenge of management on how to convince these employees to engage in their work to improve performance and attain sustainable long-term growth (Reilly, 2014).

Cognitive Work Engagement

Cognitive engagement focuses on how employees appraise the tasks in which they are involved. Kahn (1990) as cited by Clement and Eketu (2019), reported that the extent of cognitive engagement of workers within the workforce originates from an employee's appraisal of whether their work is meaningful, physically, emotionally, and psychologically safe and whether the available resources are sufficient to complete their work. This interpretation of the work domain is employed to examine and determine the holistic significance of a situation and catalyzes the intention to get engaged. According to Casimiro (2016), cognitive engagement is based on the concept of investment; it entails thinking and readiness to exert the effort that is required or required to comprehend complicated concepts and master challenging abilities. Further stated that cognitive engagement exemplifies or typically defines the different ways one thinks deeply about ideas and concepts, the extent and degree to which they create meaning of the content supplied to them, and how they use automated tactics to master their task.

Emotional Work Engagement

Emotional work engagement entails widening and investing employees' emotional resources within their control. When employees are emotionally involved with their activities or work, they invest their resources (Trust and Knowledge) in the organization. The level of affective engagement influences or prompts numerous employee behaviors, as well as staff loyalty and retention (Clement & Eketu, 2019). Furthermore, Rich, Lepine, and Crawford (2010) as cited

by Clement and Eketu (2019), emotional work engagement involves interest, boredom, anxiety, happiness, and other affective states, possibly affecting worker involvement. Affective engagement comprises positive and negative reactions. Workers' positive emotions of pride and trust originate from appraisals made about the environment during the cognitive stage. Workers who are emotionally engaged feel a strong sense of belonging and identity with their organization. Khusanova and Kang (2021) described highly engaged employees as more attentive and focused on their responsibilities than less engaged employees, as emotionally connected to their role tasks, and as more enthusiastic workers. Engaged workers also participate in social activities and hobbies outside work.

Physical Work Engagement

The physical component of employee engagement posits that higher levels of physical work engagement in an individual employee increase the readiness to devote effort within their work by not becoming quickly tired and developing the tendency to remain resolute in the face of task difficulty or failure and hence increased job performance. Workplace being can affect physical work engagement among employees (Makhanu, Mukanzi, & Nyikuli, 2018). Schaufeli (2013) has also opined that physical work engagement can enhance job performance, especially among employees, where the most engaged employees will tend to attract more favorable ratings of performance from supervisors. Employee engagement, represents a commonality among the physical, energies which individuals bring to their work role (Fluegge-Woolf, 2014).

III. METHODOLOGY

Method Used

The study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design using the quantitative approach. The survey method was employed since the researchers gathered data through a questionnaire checklist of the respondents' demographic variables, including workplace wellbeing and work engagement level. Creswell and Guetterman (2019) defined a survey as a research method used for collecting data from a predefined group of respondents to gain information and insights on various topics of interest. On the other hand, correlational research is a non-experimental research method in which a researcher measures two variables, understands, and assesses the statistical relationship between them with no influence from any extraneous variable (Bhat, 2019). For example, a correlational analysis was performed to determine the relationship between workplace wellbeing and work engagement.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

Presented below are the statistical tools utilized in the treatment and analysis of data gathered.

Frequency Counting and Percent. They are used to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, length of service, educational attainment and employment status.

Weighted Mean. This is used to quantify the respondents' ratings on the workplace wellbeing and work engagement.

Presented below are the scoring guide in giving qualitative description and interpretation of the responses of the items in workplace wellbeing and work engagement.

Scoring Procedure

Workplace Well-being

Scale	Description	Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree	Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree	High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat Agree	Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree	Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Work Engagement

Scale	Description	Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree	Very Highly Engaged
3.41-4.20	Agree	Highly Engaged
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree	Moderately Engaged
1.81-2.60	Disagree	Low Engaged
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree	Very Low Engaged

Standard Deviation. This is used to determine the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the scores where $SD \leq 3$ is homogenous and $SD > 3$ is heterogeneous (Aiken & Susane, 2001; Refugio, Galleto, & Torres, 2019).

Mann-Whitney U Test. This is used to test the difference in workplace wellbeing and work engagement when respondents are grouped in terms of sex.

Kruskal-Wallis Test. This is used to test the difference in workplace wellbeing and work engagement when respondents are grouped in terms of age, length of service, educational attainment and employment status.

Spearman Rank-Order Correlation. This is used to determine the correlation between workplace wellbeing and work engagement.

The following guide in interpreting the correlation value suggested by Cohen, West, and Aiken (2014) was utilized in this study:

Value	Size	Interpretation			
± 0.50 to ± 1.00	Large	High positive/negative correlation	± 0.30 to ± 0.49	Medium correlation	Moderate positive/negative
			± 0.10 to ± 0.29	Small correlation	Low positive/negative
			± 0.01 to ± 0.09	Negligible	Slight positive/ negative
			0.00	No correlation	

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Profile of the Respondents

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	44	46.81
Female	50	53.19
Total	94	100.00
Age	Frequency	Percent
21-30	40	42.55
31-40	21	22.34
41-50	17	18.09
51 & above	16	17.02
Total	94	100.00
Length of Service	Frequency	Percent
5 years & below	43	45.74
6-10 years	19	20.21
11-15 years	16	17.02
16 years & above	16	17.02
Total	94	100.00
Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
College Level	12	12.77
College Graduate	64	68.09
College Graduate with Masteral Units	15	15.96
Masteral /Doctoral Graduate	3	3.19
Total	94	100.00
Employment Status	Frequency	Percent
Regular/Permanent	29	30.85
Temporary/Job Order/Contractual	65	69.15
Total	94	100.00

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, length of service, educational attainment, and employment status. The data avers that the majority of the respondents are females, college graduates, and still temporary/job orders/contractual employees of the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) first and third District Engineering Offices. Forty (40) or 42.55

% are 21-30 years old and forty-three (43) or 45.74% are 5 years and below in the service. The respondents' *sex* in the present study contradicts Ngowtanasuwan (2020), revealing that men comprise 51.9% of the construction industry workforce. This figure is outstanding in the job market, demonstrating that men are making a name for themselves in the construction industry. The respondents' *age* in the present study contradicts Ngowtanasuwan (2020), who indicated that most of the construction workers were 41-50 years old, accounting for 35.2 percent of the construction workers. This suggests that 41-50 old dominate the construction industry. The respondents' *Educational attainment* in the present study contradicts Ngowtanasuwan (2020), who indicated that compared individuals with

different levels of education and 73 or 34.8 % secondary school level are dominant in the construction industry. The respondents' *years in service* in the present study supports Rani, Radzi, Almutairi, and Rahman (2022), who indicated that workers in the construction industry are 2–5 years 92 or 44.9 % in the service. The respondents' *Employment status* case in the present study contradicts Aranal (2022), who indicated that more than 47 percent of the employees (47.8 %) in the Department of Public Works and Highways 2nd District Engineering Office are regular/permanent. However, more than 44 percent are job order/contractual status (44.4%), and more than 7 percent (7.9%) are temporary.

Table 3. Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being in Terms of Work Satisfaction

A. Work Satisfaction	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. My work is fulfilling	4.00	0.70	Agree	High
2. My daily activities are giving a sense of direction and meaning	3.93	0.69	Agree	High
3. My work brings a sense of satisfaction	3.87	0.73	Agree	High
4. My work increased sense of self-worth	3.86	0.75	Agree	High
5. My work made me feel that as a person, I am flourishing	3.88	0.77	Agree	High
6. I feel capable and effective in my works on a day – to- day basis	3.88	0.71	Agree	High
7. My work offer challenges to advance my skills	4.00	0.83	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.92	0.74	Agree	High

Table 3 reveals that the perceived level of workplace well-being in terms of work satisfaction is high. The data entails that the respondents rated all indicators as "agree" and interpreted as "high" (mean=3.92, SD=0.74). This means that the respondents are highly satisfied with their work in

the first and third District Engineering Offices of the DPWH. The present finding refuted Genc and Coskun (2016), whose study revealed that employees' view of work satisfaction in the construction industry, especially in wages, is fair and does not meet their expectations.

Table 4. Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being in Terms of Organizational Respect

B. Organizational Respect	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. In general terms, I trust the senior people in my organization	4.11	0.79	Agree	High
2. I believe in the principles by which my employer operates	4.16	0.82	Agree	High
3. I feel content with the way my employer treats its employees	3.98	0.84	Agree	High
4. I feel that the employer respects staff	4.00	0.85	Agree	High
5. People at my work believe in the worth of the organization	3.94	0.86	Agree	High
Overall Mean	4.04	0.86	Agree	High

Table 4 depicts that the perceived level of workplace well-being in terms of organizational respect is high. The result manifests that organizational respect is “highly practice” (mean=4.04, SD=0.86) in the DPWH first and third District Engineering Offices. The standard deviation is less than 3 which indicates the homogeneity of

the responses. The present finding supports Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, and Encarnacion (2020) that, as a whole, the organization has respect for the employees, which means that the employees agree that there is high respect for the employees and the organization.

Table 5. Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being in Terms of Employee Care

C. Employer Care	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. At a difficult time, my boss is willing to lend an ear	4.12	0.85	Agree	High
2. My boss is caring	4.11	0.86	Agree	High
3. I feel that my boss is emphatic and understanding about my work concerns	4.10	0.84	Agree	High
4. My boss treats me as I would like to be treated	4.00	0.81	Agree	High
5. My boss shoulders some of my worries about work	3.84	0.83	Agree	High
6. I feel my transactions with my boss are, in general, positive	4.01	0.74	Agree	High
7. I believe that my employer cares about their staff's well-being	3.85	0.81	Agree	High
Overall Mean	4.00	0.83	Agree	High

Table 5 portrays that the perceived level of workplace well-being in terms of employee care is high. It denotes that the respondents rated agree to all items (mean=4.00, SD=0.83) which can be interpreted as high. This means that officers of the DPWH first and third District Engineering Offices are taking care of their employees. The standard deviation also denotes the homogeneity of the responses. The finding is

supported by Wekelo (2018), who indicated that acquiring a high-level employer is vital in developing human beings' feelings and dignity, not just workers. It makes a significant difference in the workplace. Similarly, Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, and Encarnacion (2020) claimed that employees with high-level employer care are emphatic in the workplace and positively impact work performance.

Table 6. Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being in Terms of the Intrusion of Work into Private Life

D. The Intrusion of Work Into Private Life	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. My work takes all my time including my private life	2.90	1.00	Somewhat Agree	Moderate
2. I feel stressed in organizing my work time to meet demands	2.95	0.97	Somewhat Agree	Moderate
3. I feel excessively pressured at work to meet targets	2.98	0.86	Somewhat Agree	Moderate
4. After work, I find it hard to wind down	2.76	0.85	Somewhat Agree	Moderate
5. I find myself thinking negatively about work outside office hours	2.60	0.96	Disagree	Low
Overall Mean	2.84	0.94	Somewhat Agree	Moderate

Table 6 illustrates that the perceived level of workplace well-being in terms of the intrusion of work into personal life is moderate. The outcome suggests that the respondents disagree that they are thinking negatively about work outside office hours. They somewhat agree of having excessive pressure at work to meet targets, are stressed about organizing work time to meet demands, their work takes all their time including their private life, and find it hard to wind down. Overall, intrusion of work into private life is moderately experienced (mean=2.84, SD=0.94) by the employees of the first and third district engineering offices. The standard deviation also signifies homogeneity. The present discovery supports Rollings (2019) who found that employees acquiring somewhat agree/moderate in the intrusion of work into private life make employees less creative and illicit stress and anxiety in the working world.

In addition, the deadline contributes to “tunnel vision,” in which the employees focus on the deadline ahead and forget another vital task.

The current findings also argue Stenger (2018), who disclosed that drawing a clear line between work and personal life is not simple. Still, if one allows their work-related to spill over into one’s personal life, one may find themselves spending as much time on office drama over private life, and family life. Stenger further stated that protecting personal space and setting clear boundaries at work can benefit one’s mental well-being, reduce stress and improve social dynamics. Similarly, separating the two roles can improve efficiency and reduce stress on the part of employees (Career Center, n.d.).

Table 7. Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being in Terms of Autonomy Needs

E. Autonomy Needs	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. At work, I feel a sense of choice and freedom in the things I undertake	3.47	0.68	Agree	High
2. I feel that my decisions on my job reflect what I really want	3.41	0.84	Agree	High
3. I feel my choices on my job express who really, I am.	3.49	0.83	Agree	High
4. I feel I have been doing what really interests me in my job	3.49	0.88	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.47	0.81	Agree	High

Table 7 displays that the perceived level of workplace well-being in terms of autonomy needs is high. The data conveys that autonomy needs are highly experienced (mean=3.47, SD=0.81) by the employees of the DPWH first and third district engineering offices. This implies that the head of offices of the DPWH first and third district engineering offices are allowing autonomy to their employees. The current finding backs up Abun et al. (2020) who confirmed that satisfying autonomy needs is essential for optimal

human functioning and well-being. In addition, employees with high autonomy needs could make confident in their work and contribute to the overall organization's success. Furthermore, psychological research showed that when employees are given the autonomy or freedom to do the job according to what and how they are going to accomplish it without the necessary intervention and monitoring from the management, the level of job satisfaction increases, and the level of turnover decreases (Robertson, 2019).

Table 8. Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being in Terms of Relatedness Needs

F. Relatedness Needs	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I feel that the people I care at work about also care about me	3.63	0.73	Agree	High
2. I feel connected with people who care for me at work & for whom I care at work	3.76	0.69	Agree	High
3. At work, I feel close and connected with other people who are important to me	3.74	0.78	Agree	High
4. I experience a warm feeling with the people I spend time with at work	3.73	0.70	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.72	0.73	Agree	High

Table 8 reflects that the perceived level of workplace well-being in terms of relatedness needs is high. The result asserts that related needs are highly experienced (mean=3.72, SD=0.73) by the employees of the DPWH first and third district engineering offices. This denotes that the administration of DPWH is highly taking into consideration the relatedness needs of the employees. The results of this

study agree with those of Abun et al. (2020), who found out that people scoring high relatedness needs predict well-being and correlate to the strong relationship between people and well-being. Individuals display three basic psychological needs to develop and consequently improve optimal functioning and the optimal well-being of employees.

Table 9. Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being in Terms of Competence Need

G. Competence Need	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I feel confident that I can do things well on my job	3.88	0.77	Agree	High
2. At work, I feel capable of what I do	3.82	0.67	Agree	High
3. When I am at work, I feel competent to achieve my goals	3.77	0.78	Agree	High
4. In my job, I feel I can successfully complete a difficult task	3.80	0.71	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.82	0.73	Agree	High

Table 9 discloses that the perceived level of workplace well-being in terms of competence needs is high. The data indicates that the employees feel confident that they can do things well on their job, are capable of what they do, can successfully complete a difficult job, and are competent to achieve goals. This results was confirmed by Abun et al. (2020), who stated that Individuals with a high level of competence need can allow them to explore the environment and engage in challenging tasks to test their

ability and skills. In addition, satisfying such needs enables the Individual to adapt to complex and changing environments. Similarly, Legault (2017) contended that the desire to satisfy the need for competence motivates people to persist and maintain efforts and self-determination to continue to improve one's skills and abilities to work. Satisfying competence need is essential for psychological growth and well-being.

Table 10. Summary of Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being

Workplace Well-being	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
A. Work Satisfaction	3.92	0.74	Agree	High
B. Organizational Respect	4.04	0.84	Agree	High
C. Employees Care	4.00	0.83	Agree	High
D. The Intrusion of Work into Private Life	2.84	0.94	Somewhat Agree	Moderate
E. Autonomy Needs	3.47	0.81	Agree	High
F. Relatedness Needs	3.72	0.73	Agree	High
G. Competence Need	3.82	0.73	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.72	0.90	Agree	High

Table 10 conveys the summary of the perceived level of workplace well-being. The outcome attests that organizational respect, employee care, work satisfaction, competence need, relatedness needs, and autonomy needs are highly felt by the employees of the first and third district

engineering offices of DPWH. But the intrusion of work into private life is moderately experienced by the employees. Overall, workplace well-being is highly felt (mean=3.72, SD=0.90) by the employees of the first and third district engineering offices of DPWH. The current

finding corroborates the Self-Determination Theory of Ryan and Deci (2000), which stated that people with a high level of workplace well-being support the growth of these needs to create a healthy workplace environment and the well-being of employees. Also, Bartels, Peterson, and Reina, (2019) confirmed that people scoring with a high level of workplace well-being lead them to be more intrinsically motivated and more creatively engaged later in life than individuals who have lower levels of workplace well-being.

Furthermore, the present study supports Yadav (2020) who indicated that individuals with high workplace well-being behave in various ways, leading to higher work engagement. The present study however supports Abun et al.(2020) who disclosed that individuals with a low level of intrusion of work into their private life interfered with their personal life.

Table 11. Perceived Level of Work Engagement in Terms of Cognitive

A. Cognitive	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. My mind is often full of ideas about my work	3.79	0.70	Agree	Highly Engaged
2. My mind is fully engaged with my work	3.77	0.71	Agree	Highly Engaged
3. I have an idea about how to perform my work better	3.88	0.68	Agree	Highly Engaged
4. I search for new ways to improve my knowledge related to my work	3.91	0.68	Agree	Highly Engaged
5. My thoughts are fully focused when thinking about my work	3.93	0.69	Agree	Highly Engaged
Overall Mean	3.86	0.69	Agree	Highly Engaged

Table 11 presents the perceived level of respondents' cognitive work engagement. It suggests that the employees of DPWH first and third district engineering offices are highly engaged ($\text{mean}=3.86$, $\text{SD}=0.69$) in terms of cognitive. This means that the employees are fully focused when thinking about work, search for new ways to improve knowledge related to work, have an idea about how to perform work better, are often full of ideas about work, and are fully engaged in the work. The current finding confirmed Abun et al. (2021) discovery that when

individuals scoring with a high level of cognitive acquiring the knowledge about their work and their mind are highly engaged in their work, have the idea on how to carry out their work, keep on improving their work by getting more new knowledge about their work, and are fully focused on their work. Similarly, Clement and Eketu (2019), claimed that people with a high-level of cognitive engagement are acutely aware of and aligned with the organizational strategy and know what they require to provide the best return on their job effort.

Table 12. Perceived Level of Work Engagement in Terms of Emotional

B. Emotional	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I feel very delighted about what I am doing whenever I am working	3.82	0.68	Agree	Highly Engaged
2. I am excited to do my work	3.85	0.74	Agree	Highly Engaged
3. I feel good about the work that I do	3.93	0.70	Agree	Highly Engaged
4. I am always very enthusiastic to perform my work	3.79	0.71	Agree	Highly Engaged
5. I feel very happy when I carry out my responsibilities at work	3.87	0.78	Agree	Highly Engaged
Overall Mean	3.85	0.73	Agree	Highly Engaged

Table 12 shows the perceived level of emotional work engagement of employees in the first and third district engineering offices. As shown in the table, emotional work engagement is highly encountered (mean=3.85, SD=0.73) by the employees. It means that the employees feel good about the work that they do, feel very happy when carrying responsibilities at work, are excited to do work, are very delighted about what they are doing, and are always very enthusiastic to perform their work. The finding is supported by Clement and Eketu (2019), who indicated that people

scoring a high level of emotional engagement and highly emotionally engaged feel a strong sense of belonging and identity with their organization. Similarly, Khusanova and Kang (2021) claimed that highly engaged employees are more attentive and focused on their responsibilities than less engaged employees, as emotionally connected to their role tasks, and as more enthusiastic workers. Engaged workers also participate in social activities and hobbies outside work.

Table 13. Perceived Level of Work Engagement in Terms of Physical

C. Physical	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. No matter how much I work, I still have a high level of energy	3.64	0.81	Agree	Highly Engaged
2. I have a great deal of stamina for my work	3.68	0.77	Agree	Highly Engaged
3. I have a lot of energy for my work	3.70	0.78	Agree	Highly Engaged
4. I am frequently energized by my work	3.68	0.79	Agree	Highly Engaged
5. Though my work is physically challenging, I am still excited to do	3.79	0.78	Agree	Highly Engaged
Overall Mean	3.70	0.79	Agree	Highly Engaged

Table 13 reveals the perceived level of physical work engagement of employees of DPWH first and third district engineering offices. The data signifies that physical work engagement is highly practiced (mean=3.70, SD=0.79) by the employees. This entails that though work is physically challenging, they are still excited to perform, have a lot of energy for the work, have a great deal of stamina, and are frequently energized. The present discovery supports Makhanu, Mukanzi, and Nyikuli (2018) who revealed that employees scoring with a high level of physical work

engagement increases the readiness to devote effort within their work by not becoming quickly tired and developing the tendency to remain resolute in the face of task difficulty or failure and hence increased job performance. The current finding also argues Schaufeli (2013), who indicated that physical work engagement could enhance job performance, especially among employees, where the most engaged employees will tend to attract more favorable ratings of performance from supervisors.

Table 14. Summary of the Perceived Level of Work Engagement

Work Engagement	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
A. Cognitive	3.86	0.69	Agree	Highly Engaged
B. Emotional	3.85	0.73	Agree	Highly Engaged
C. Physical	3.70	0.79	Agree	Highly Engaged
Overall Mean	3.80	0.74	Agree	Highly Engaged

Table 14 depicts the summary of the perceived level of work engagement of employees in the first and third district engineering offices of the DPWH. It avers that the respondents are highly engaged (mean=3.80, SD=0.74) in their respective work assignments. It also conveys that cognitive, emotional, and physical work engagements are highly practiced by the employees of the first and third district engineering offices of the DPWH. The current

finding corroborates the Work Engagement Theory of Khan (1990) which states that a person who shows self-preference in job tasks to promote connections between self and job, which can increase role performance through cognitive, emotional, and physical self-investment. Also, Khusanova and Kang (2021) confirmed that highly engaged employees invest their emotional, cognitive, and physical energies in their work to achieve superior work performance.

Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being

Table 15. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Sex

Workplace Well-being	U-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Work Satisfaction	881.000	0.088	Not Significant
B. Organizational Respect	968.500	0.306	Not Significant
C. Employees Care	980.500	0.355	Not Significant
D. The Intrusion of Work into Private Life	1018.00	0.521	Not Significant
E. Autonomy Needs	1008.500	0.472	Not Significant
F. Relatedness Needs	986.000	0.367	Not Significant
G. Competence Need	854.500	0.052	Not Significant
Overall	841.500	0.053	Not Significant

Table 15 portrays the test of difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being when respondents are grouped in terms of sex. Using Mann-Whitney U Test, the result conveys that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being ($U=841.500$, $p=0.053$) when respondents are grouped in terms of sex. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This implies that

how male and female employees perceive workplace well-being does not significantly differ. This further implies that sex has no significant effect on the perception of the employees. The finding is supported by Tay, Ng, Kuykendall, and Diener (2014), who stated that the demographic variable there is no significant difference in workplace well-being.

Table 16. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Age

Workplace Well-being	H-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Work Satisfaction	1.070	0.784	Not Significant
B. Organizational Respect	4.370	0.224	Not Significant
C. Employees Care	8.454	0.038	Significant
D. The Intrusion of Work into Private Life	9.732	0.021	Significant
E. Autonomy Needs	4.060	0.255	Not Significant
F. Relatedness Needs	7.874	0.049	Significant
G. Competence Need	7.458	0.059	Not Significant
Overall	2.358	0.502	Not Significant

Table 16 illustrates the test of difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being when respondents are grouped in terms of age. Applying Kruskal-Wallis H Test, the outcome denotes that there exists a significant difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being in terms of employee care, intrusion of work into private life, and relatedness needs when respondents are grouped in terms of age. But there is no significant difference in terms of work satisfaction, organizational respect, autonomy needs, and competence need. Overall, there is no significant difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being ($H=2.358$,

$p=0.502$) when respondents are grouped in terms of age. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This indicates that how respondents of different age brackets perceive workplace well-being does not significantly differ. This further indicates that the perception of employees on workplace well-being is not affected by their age bracket. The present study contradicts Kanengoni and Bodat (2014), who indicated that demographic variables such as age influence the workplace well-being of employees. Also stated that there is a significant difference in workplace well-being.

Table 17. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Length of Service

Workplace Well-being	H-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Work Satisfaction	2.198	0.532	Not Significant
B. Organizational Respect	3.523	0.318	Not Significant
C. Employees Care	4.607	0.203	Not Significant
D. The Intrusion of Work into Private Life	5.825	0.120	Not Significant
E. Autonomy Needs	4.414	0.220	Not Significant
F. Relatedness Needs	3.803	0.284	Not Significant
G. Competence Need	4.517	0.211	Not Significant
Overall Mean	1.320	0.724	Not Significant

Table 17 displays the test of difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being of the employees in the DPWH first and third district engineering offices when respondents are grouped in terms of length of service. Employing Kruskal-Wallis H Test, it yielded that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being ($H=1.320$, $p=0.724$) when respondents are grouped in terms of length of service. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This finding suggests that how

employees of different lengths of service perceive workplace well-being does not significantly differ. This further suggests that age has no significant effect on the perception of the employees. The present study contradicts Wright, Cropanzano, and Bonett (2014), who indicated that moderating variables, such as organizational tenure, positively affect employees' workplace well-being. Also stated that there is significant difference in workplace well-being.

Table 18. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Educational Attainment

Workplace Well-being	H-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Work Satisfaction	2.370	0.499	Not Significant
B. Organizational Respect	2.052	0.562	Not Significant
C. Employees Care	0.324	0.955	Not Significant
D. The Intrusion of Work into Private Life	3.741	0.291	Not Significant
E. Autonomy Needs	1.725	0.631	Not Significant
F. Relatedness Needs	2.385	0.496	Not Significant
G. Competence Need	3.037	0.386	Not Significant
Overall Mean	1.904	0.593	Not Significant

Table 18 reflects the test of difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being when respondents are grouped in terms of educational attainment. Utilizing Kruskal-Wallis H Test, the result shows that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being ($H=1.904$, $p=0.593$) when respondents are grouped in terms of educational attainment. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This signifies that how respondents of different

educational attainment perceive workplace well-being does not significantly differ. This further signifies that the perception of the employees is not significantly affected by their educational attainment. The present study contradicts Kanengoni and Bodat (2014), who indicated that demographic variables such as educational status influences the workplace well-being of employees. Also stated that there is a significant difference in workplace well-being.

Table 19. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Workplace Well-being When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Employment Status

Workplace Well-being	U-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Work Satisfaction	940.500	0.987	Not Significant
B. Organizational Respect	766.000	0.137	Not Significant
C. Employees Care	747.500	0.103	Not Significant
D. The Intrusion of Work into Private Life	784.500	0.182	Not Significant
E. Autonomy Needs	771.500	0.147	Not Significant
F. Relatedness Needs	808.500	0.252	Not Significant
G. Competence Need	738.500	0.080	Not Significant
Overall Mean	851.000	0.439	Not Significant

Table 19 discloses the test of difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being when respondents are grouped in terms of employment status. Using the Mann-Whitney U test, the result conveys that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of workplace well-being ($U=851.00$, $p=0.439$) when respondents are grouped in terms of employment status. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This finding entails that how respondents of different employment statuses perceive workplace well-being does not significantly differ. This further entails that employment status has no significant

effect on the employees' perception of workplace well-being. The current study contradicts Dorji and Gurung (2019) which indicated that socio-demographics, such as employment status, and level of education have a positive effect on the workplace well-being of employees. Also stated that there is a significant difference in workplace well-being.

Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Work Engagement

Table 20. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Work Engagement When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Sex

Work Engagement	U-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Cognitive	973.500	0.321	Not Significant
B. Emotional	871.000	0.071	Not Significant
C. Physical	951.000	0.244	Not Significant
Overall Mean	955.500	0.257	Not Significant

Table 20 manifests the test of difference in perceived level of work engagement when respondents are grouped in terms of sex. With the Mann-Whitney U test, the data asserts that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of work engagement ($U=955.500$, $p=0.25$) when respondents are grouped in terms of sex. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This means that how male and female employees

perceive work engagement does not significantly differ. This further means that sex has no significant effect on the respondents' perception of work engagement. The results of this study agree with those of Caisip (2021) and Heniel and Naparota (2021) who found out no significant differences in their score measuring Work Engagement compared to sex.

Table 21. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Work Engagement When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Age

Work Engagement	H-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Cognitive	2.349	0.503	Not Significant
B. Emotional	3.026	0.388	Not Significant
C. Physical	2.507	0.474	Not Significant
Overall Mean	1.893	0.595	Not Significant

Table 21 presents the test of difference in the perceived level of work engagement when respondents are grouped in terms of age. Employing the Kruskal-Wallis H test, it yielded that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of work engagement ($H=1.893$, $p=0.595$) when respondents are grouped in terms of age. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This implies that how employees of different age brackets perceive work engagement does not significantly differ. This further implies that the respondents' perception is not significantly

Table 22. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Work Engagement When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Length of Service

Work Engagement	H-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Cognitive	1.707	0.635	Not Significant
B. Emotional	1.951	0.583	Not Significant
C. Physical	0.800	0.850	Not Significant
Overall Mean	1.763	0.623	Not Significant

Table 22 shows the test of difference in the perceived level of work engagement when respondents are grouped in terms of length of service. With the Kruskal-Wallis H test, the result attests that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of work engagement ($H=1.763$, $p=0.623$) when respondents are grouped in terms of length of service. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This finding denotes that how respondents of different lengths of service

affected by their age. The current finding contradicts Mokhine and Geyser (2020) who indicated that demographic variables such as age influence the work engagement of employees. Also stated that there is a significant difference in work engagement.

Similarly, the current finding contradicts Heniel and Naparota (2021) discovery that when respondents were categorized by age, there was no significant difference in work engagement.

Table 23. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Work Engagement When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Educational Attainment

Work Engagement	H-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Cognitive	1.703	0.636	Not Significant
B. Emotional	7.773	0.051	Not Significant
C. Physical	5.878	0.118	Not Significant
Overall Mean	2.819	0.420	Not Significant

Table 23 reveals the test of difference in the perceived level of work engagement when respondents are grouped in terms of educational attainment. Using the Kruskal-Wallis H test, the data indicates that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of work engagement ($H=2.819$, $p=0.420$) when respondents are grouped in terms of educational attainment. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This entails that how respondents of different educational attainment perceive work engagement does not

perceive work engagement does not significantly differ. This further denotes that length of service has no significant effect on the employees' perception. The current finding contradicts Khusanova and Kang, 2021) who indicated that demographic variables such as organizational tenure influences the work engagement of employees. Also stated that there is a significant difference in work engagement.

significantly differ. This further entails that the respondents' perception of work engagement is not significantly affected by their educational attainment. The current finding contradicts Mokhine and Geyser (2020) who indicated that demographic variables such as educational status influences the work engagement of employees. They also stated that the educational status there is a significant difference in workplace well-being.

Table 24. Test of Difference in the Perceived Level of Work Engagement When Respondents are grouped in Terms of Employment Status

Work Engagement	U-value	p-value	Interpretation
A. Cognitive	853.000	0.448	Not Significant
B. Emotional	892.000	0.667	Not Significant
C. Physical	769.000	0.142	Not Significant
Overall Mean	894.500	0.684	Not Significant

Table 24 reflects the test of difference in the perceived level of work engagement when respondents are grouped in terms of employment status. Applying the Mann-Whitney U test, the result suggests that there is no significant difference in the perceived level of work engagement ($U=894.500$, $p=0.684$) when respondents are grouped in terms of employment status. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. This finding signifies that how respondents of different employment statuses perceive work engagement does not significantly differ. This further signifies that employment status has no significant effect on employees' perception of

work engagement. The current finding supports Heniel and Naparota (2021) discovery that when respondents were categorized by employment status, there was no significant difference in work engagement.

However, the present finding is in contrary to the study of Caisip (2021) which revealed that there is significant difference of employment status in all domains of Work Engagement.

Correlation between Workplace Well-being and Work Engagement

Table 25. Test of Relationship between Workplace Well-being and Work Engagement

Workplace Well-being	Correlation & p-values	Work Engagement			
		Cognitive	Emotional	Physical	Overall
Work Satisfaction	Correlation value	0.635	0.694	0.625	0.704
	p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Organizational Respect	Correlation value	0.615	0.609	0.555	0.601
	p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Employee Care	Correlation value	0.532	0.529	0.460	0.561
	p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
The Intrusion of Work into Private Life	Correlation value	0.000	0.093	0.189	0.142
	p-value	1.000	0.371	0.069	0.172
Autonomy Needs	Correlation value	0.491	0.561	0.525	0.551
	p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Relatedness Needs	Correlation value	0.482	0.571	0.505	0.529
	p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Competence Need	Correlation value	0.564	0.561	0.404	0.529
	p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Overall	Correlation value	0.641	0.687	0.544	0.644
	p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Table 25 discloses the test of the relationship between workplace well-being and work engagement. Utilizing Spearman rho, it yielded a high positive correlation ($\rho=0.644$, $p<0.001$) between workplace well-being and

work engagement. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that as the level of workplace well-being increases, the level of work engagement also increases. This

further indicates that work engagement is dependent on workplace well-being.

The new research corroborates the findings of Aiello et al. (2018) who discovered a strong correlation between workplace well-being and work engagement. This finding also supports Abun, Magallanes, Foronda, and Encarnacion (2020) finding that workplace well-being correlates significantly with work engagement of employee's sex. The higher workplace well-being group employees demonstrated higher work engagement and personal accomplishment, whereas low workplace well-being group employees exhibited higher work engagement and job performance.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that DPWH employees' surveyed demographic profiles do not affect workplace well-being and work engagement among employees. They have a high level of well-being in the workplace. However, they have moderate well-being in the workplace when entering work into their private life. They are also physically, cognitively, and emotionally highly engaged in their daily work. This justified that the policy and organizational culture energize employees and the environment of the DPWH to achieve superior work performance. Furthermore, DPWH employees' well-being in the workplace influences works engagement. Moreover, those with high workplace well-being have a high level of work engagement. Those with low-level workplace well-being have a low level of work engagement.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Acidera, E. B., Encarnacion, M. J., & Domingcil, C. U. (2021). Work Environment and work Engagement of Employees of the Catholic Colleges in the Ilocos Region, Philippines. . *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 19, 439.
- [2] Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Foronda, S. L., & Encarnacion, M. J. (2020). Employees' workplace well-being and work engagement of divine word colleges' employees in Ilocos region, Philippines. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 9(2), 70-84.
- [3] Abun, D., Magallanez, T., Foronda, S. L., & Agoot, F. (2019). Measuring Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction and Frustration and Work Engagement of Employees of Divine Word Colleges in Ilocos Region, Philippines. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*, 4(2).
- [4] Abun, D., Menor, R. I., Catabagan, N. C., Magallanes, T., & Ranay, F. B. (2021). Organizational climate and work engagement of employees of divine word colleges in Ilocos Region, Philippines. . *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 10(1), 107-121.
- [5] Abun, D., Menor, R. I., Catabagan, N. C., Magallanes, T., & Ranay, F. B. (2021)). Organizational climate and work engagement of employees of divine word colleges in Ilocos Region, Philippines. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 10(1), 107-121.
- [6] Abun, D., Tabur, M., & Agoot, F. (2017). Leadership Skills of Administrators of Divine Word Colleges in Region I, the Philippines as Perceived by Employees and Employees' Work Engagement. *IJRDO-Journal of Applied Management Science*, 3(12).
- [7] Aiello, A., Tesi, A., & Gianetti, A. (2018). The work-related well-being of social workers: Framing job demands, psychological well being, and work engagement. *Journal of Social Work*, 19(1), 121-14.
- [8] Aiken, L., & Susane, G. (2001). West Multiple Progression. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publishing, Inc.
- [9] Anwarsyah, W., & Salendu, A. (2012). "Hubungan antara Job Demands dengan Workplace Well-Being pada Pekerja Shift." . *Jurnal Psikologi Pitutur*. Vol. 1, No. 1, Hal. 32-44. .
- [10] Aranal, D. (2022). The Effect of Servant Leadership On the Employees' Job Satisfaction at The Department of Public Works and Highways 2nd District Engineering Office. *Unpublished*.
- [11] Aryanti, R. D., Sari, E. Y., & Widiana, H. S. (2020). A Literature Review of Workplace Well-Being. In *International Conference on Community Development (ICCD 2020)* (pp. 605-609). Atlantis Press.
- [12] Barden, C. L. (2018). "The Correlation Between Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction in the Social Security Administration" (2018). *All Capstone Projects*. doi:<https://opus.govst.edu/capstones/365>
- [13] Bartels, A. L., Peterson, S. J., & Reina, C. S. (2019). Understanding well-being at work: Development and validation of the eudaimonic workplace well-being scale. . *PloS one*, 14(4), e0215957.
- [14] Baumeister, R., & Leary, M. (1995). The need to belong. The desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. . *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529.
- [15] Bhat, A. (2019). What is a correlational study? – Definition with examples. Retrieved from <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/correlational-research/>.
- [16] Bhat, A. (2019). What is a correlational study? – Definition with examples. Retrieved from <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/correlational-research/>.
- [17] Caisip, J. (2021). Work Engagement and Work Meaning among Accountancy, Business, and Management (ABM) Faculty. . *Asia Pacific Journal of Academic Research in Business Administration* /, 7 (2), 32-35. Retrieved from Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Documents/W
- [18] CareerCenter. (n.d). Separate Your Personal and Professional Life. UCCS: University of Colorado, Colorado Springs. . Retrieved from <https://www.uccs.edu/career/resources/students/professional-etiquette-in-the-workplace/separate-your-personal-and-profession>.
- [19] Casimiro, L. T. (2016). Cognitive engagement in online intercultural interactions: Beyond analysis. *International*

journal of information and education technology., 6(6), 441-447.

[20] Chang, J., Huang, C., & Lin, Y. (2015). Mindfulness, Basic Psychological Needs Fulfillment and Well-Being . *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16(5), 1149–1162.

[21] Chughtai, A., & Buckley, F. (2008). Work Engagement and Its Relationship with State and Trait Trust: A Conceptual Analysis. *Journal of Behavioural and Applied Management*, 10(1), , 47-71.

[22] Clement, O. I., & Eketu, C. A. (2019). Organizational climate and employee engagement in banks in rivers state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research*, 5(3), 57-84.

[23] Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2014). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Psychology Press.

[24] Creswell, J., & Gutterman. (2014). Research Design Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Approaches.

[25] Davis, T. (2019). What is Well-Being? Definition, Type and Well-Being Skills. . *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/click-here-happiness/201901/what-is-well-being-definition-types-and-well-being-skills>.

[26] deCharms, R. (1968). Personal Causation. New York: Academic Press.

[27] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. (2000). "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions". *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54 -67. doi: CiteSeerX 10.1.1.318.808. DOI:10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

[28] De-la-Calle-Durán, M., & Rodríguez-Sánchez, J. (2021). Employee Engagement and Wellbeing in Times of COVID-19: A Proposal of the 5Cs Model. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021 May 20;18(10):5470. doi:doi: 10.3390/ijerph18105470. PMID: 34065338; PMCID: PMC8160631.

[29] Dickson-Swift, V., Fox, C., Marshall, K., & Willis, J. M. (2014). What really improves employee health and wellbeing: Findings from regional Australian workplaces. . *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 7(3), 138-155.

[30] Doran, C. M., Ling, R., Gullestrup, J., Swannwill, J., & Milner, A. (2016). The impact of a suicide prevention strategy on reducing the economic cost of suicide in the New South Wales construction industry. . *Crisis*, 37(2), 121-129.

[31] Dorji, N. D., & Gurung, M. (2019). Socio-demographic correlates of psychological well-being among older adults in Bhutan. . *Environment and Social Psychology*, 4(2).

[32] Dresdale, R. (2016). Work-Life Balance vs. Work-Life Integration, Is there really a difference? *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/rachelritlop/2016/12/18/work-life-balance-vs-work-life-integration-is-there-really-a-difference/#5686f6e237>.

[33] Durden, O. (2019). What Responsibilities Does Business Have towards Its Employees? *Chron*. Retrieved from <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/responsibilities-business-toward-its-employees-25364.html>.

[34] Fluegge-Woolf, E. (2014). Play Hard, Work Hard: Fun at Work and Job Performance. *Management Research Review*, 37(8), 682-705.

[35] Genc, O., & Coskun, H. (2016). Job satisfaction level of construction industry employees. . In *3rd International Scientific Meeting E-GTZ* (pp. 903-909).

[36] George, M. L., & Emuze, F. (2020). The Well-Being of People in Construction. *Health and Safety in the Malawian Construction Industry*. doi:DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-69627-0_123-1

[37] Group, H. H. (2020). Available online: <https://theholistichealthcaregroup.com/2020/02/mental-health-in-the-construction-industry/> (accessed on 4 May 2022).

[38] Harter, S. (1978). Effecting motivation is reconsidered: toward a developmental model. . *Human Development*, 21(1),661-669. .

[39] Heatfield, S. (2019). How to Demonstrate Respect in the Workplace. Retrieved from Retrieved from <https://www.thebalancecareers.com/how-to-demonstrate-respect-in-the-workplace-1919376>

[40] Heniel, K., & Naparota, L. (2021). Organizational Learning Capabilities and Work Engagement among Employees in Jose Rizal Memorial State University System. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 6(1).

[41] Hong, H., Yee, K., Khai, L., Cheong, P., & Kang, T. (2014). Factors that Affecting Work Engagement in the Hospitality Industry. . *Unpublished Thesis: Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman*. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org>.

[42] Huppert, F. A., & So, T. T. (2013). Flourishing across Europe: Application of a new conceptual framework for defining well being. *Social Indicators Research*, 110(3), 837–861. doi:Doi:10.1007/s11205-011-99

[43] ILO. (2020). Workplace Well-Being. *International Labour Organization*. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org>.

[44] Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. . *Acad. Manag. J.* 33, 692–724. doi: 10.5465/256287.

[45] Khusanova, R., & Kang, S. C. (2021). Work Engagement Among Public Employees: Antecedents and Consequences. *Front Psychol.* 2021 Oct 22;12:684495. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.684495. PMID: 34744859; PMCID: PMC8569609.

[46] Kohl, A. (2018). What Employees Really Want at Work? *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/alankohll/2018/07/10/what-employees-really-want-at-work/#3e11512f5ad>.

[47] Kuok, A., & Taormina, R. (2017). Work Engagement: Evolution of the Concept and a New Inventory. . *Psychological Thought*, 10(2), 262-287.

[48] Kuok, A., & Taormina, R. (2017). Work Engagement: Evolution of the Concept and a New Inventory. . *Psychological Thought*, 10(2), 262-287. .

[49] Kurniadewi, E. (2016.). “Psychological Capital dan Workplace Well-Being sebagai Prediktor bagi Employee Engagement.” . *Jurnal Psikologi Integratif*. Vol. 4, No. 2, Hal. 95- 112. .

[50] Legault, L. (2016). The Need for Autonomy. New York: Springer International Publishing. .

[51] Lovina, R., Genuba, R., & Naparota, L. (2020). Structural Equation Model on Work Engagement of Non-Commissioned Police Officers. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 5(4). doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.54.22>

[52] Makhanu, R., Mukanzi, C., & Nyikuli, E. S. (2018). Influence of Physical Engagement on Job Performance among Employees in the Civil Service: A Case of Kakamega Regional Head Quarters in Kenya. *Int. J. of Multidisciplinary and Current research*, 6.

[53] Mansoor, F., & Hassan, Z. (2016). Factors influencing Employee Engagement: A study on a Telecommunication Network provider in the Maldives. . *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, 4 (1) <https://doi.org/10.24924/ijabm/2016.04/v4.iss1/50.64>.

[54] Matare, M. A. (2020). An Investigation Into Employee Engagement and Its Impact on Organisational Performance: A Case Study of Northlands Medical Group, Namibia. GRIN Verlag.

[55] Mokhine, P., & Geyser, I. (2020). The Impact of Demographic Influences on Work Engagement for Front of House Female Hotel Employees. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure.*, 9(5), 842-855.

[56] Ngowtanasuwan, G. (2020). August). Factor Analysis of Worker Engagement in Construction Projects in Thailand. . In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* (Vol. 910, No. 1, p. 012018). IOP Publishing.

[57] Nishimura, T., & Suzuki, T. (2016). Basic psychological need satisfaction and frustration in Japan: controlling for the big five personality traits. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 58(4), 320-331.

[58] O'Riain, E., Spillane, J., & Sherratt, F. (2018). Healthy, happy workers? The consequences of commuting between Northern Ireland and Great Britain. In: Gorse C (ed) Proceeding of the 34th annual ARCOM conference. . *Association of Researchers in Construction, Belfast*, 311–320.

[59] Potter, T. (2014). Breaking down the hierarchies. . *Nursing Management - UK*, 21(5), and 12. .

[60] Powell, A., Galea, N., Salignac, F., Loosemore, M., & Chappell, L. (2018). Masculinity and workplace wellbeing in the Australian construction industry. Proc., . *Association of Researchers in Construction Management*, 321-330.

[61] Rani, H. A., Radzi, A. R., Alias, A. R., Almutairi, S., & Rahman, R. A. (2022). Factors Affecting Workplace Well-Being: Building Construction Projects. *Buildings*, 12(7), 910.

[62] Rani, H., Radzi, A. R., Almutairi, S., & Rahman, R. A. (2022). Factors Affecting Workplace Well-Being: Building Construction Projects. *Buildings*, 12(7), 910.

[63] Refugio, C., Galleto, P., & Torres, R. (2019). Competence landscape of grade 9 mathematics teachers: Basis for an enhancement program. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 14(2), 241-256.

[64] Reilly, A. (2014). Whatever Engaged Employees do such as Solve Problems. Course Hero. Retrieved from <https://www.coursehero.com>.

[65] Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*, 53, 617-635.

[66] Rigg, J., Sydnor, S., Nicely, A., & Day, J. (2014). Employee engagement in Jamaican hotels: do demographic and organizational characteristics matter?. . *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 13(1), 1-16.

[67] Robertson, T. (2019). The Effect of Autonomy on Job satisfaction. Chron. . Retrieved from <https://work.chron.com/effects-autonomy-job-satisfaction-14677.html>.

[68] Rogers, K., & Ashforth, B. (2014). Respect in Organizations: Feeling Valued as “We” and “Me”. *SAGE journals*, 43(5), 1578-1608. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314557159>

[69] Rollings, M. (2019). Do Deadlines Help Us Get Stuff Done? Hive. . Retrieved from <https://hive.com>.

[70] Salisu, J. B., Chinyio, E., & Suresh, S. (2015). The impact of compensation on the job satisfaction of public sector construction workers of jigawa state of Nigeria. . *The Business & Management Review*, 6(4), 282.

[71] Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Work engagement. What do we know and where do we go? . *Romanian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14(1), 3-10.

[72] Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). What is engagement? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.),. *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

[73] Shuck, B., & Reio Jr, T. G. (2014). Employee engagement and well-being: A moderation model and implications for practice. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 43-58.

[74] Shuck, B., & Reio, T. G. (2014). Employee Engagement and Well-Being: A Moderation Model and Implications for Practice. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 43–58.

[75] Shuck, B., Ghosh, R., Sigarmi, D., & Nimon, K. (2013). The jingle jangle of employee engagement: Further exploration of the emerging construct and implications for workplace learning and performance. *Human resource development review*, 12(1), 11-35.

[76] Sonnentag, S. (2015). Wellbeing and burnout in the workplace: Organizational causes and consequences. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 537-540. doi: doi:10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.73021-2

[77] Stenger, M. (2018). Four Ways to Keep Your Personal Life Out of the Office. Career Contessa. . Retrieved from <https://www.careercontessa.com/advice/privacy-work-life-balance/>.

[78] Tay, L., Ng, V., Kuykendall, L., & Diener, E. (2014). Demographic factors and worker well-being: An empirical review using representative data from the United States and across the world. The role of demographics in occupational stress and well being.

[79] Vansteenkiste, M., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). On psychological growth and vulnerability: Basic psychological need

satisfaction and need frustration as a unifying principle.
Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 23(3), 263–280.

[80] Wang, W., Fu, Y., Gao, J., Shang, K., Gao, Xing, J., & Mi, L. (2021). How the COVID-19 outbreak affected organizational citizenship behavior in emergency construction megaprojects: Case study from two emergency hospital projects in Wuhan,. *China. J. Journal of Management in Engineering.*, 37(3). doi:04021008.

[81] Warr, P., & Inceoglu, I. (2012). Job engagement, job satisfaction, and contrasting associations with person-job fit. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(2), 129–138. doi:10.1037/a0026859.

[82] Wekelo, K. (2018). 4 Ways Employers Should Show Their Employees They Care. *Entrepreneur: Small Business Heroes*. . Retrieved from <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/312721>.

[83] Wong, Y. H., Mon-Ho, R., Wang, S., & Miller, I. S. (2016). Meta-analyses of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and mental health-related outcomes. . *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 64(1) 80-93.

[84] Wright, T. A., Cropanzano, R., & Bonett, D. G. (2014). The moderating role of employee positive well being on the relation between job satisfaction and job performance. . *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 12(2), 93.

[85] Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., & Fischbach, A. (2013). Work engagement among employees facing emotional demands: The role of personal resources. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 12(2), 74-84. doi: doi:10.1027/1866-5888/a000085

[86] Yadav, P. (2020). The Relationship Between Employee Engagement and Psychological Well-Being. . Available at SSRN 3628288.